IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

Case No. 1:10-192

Plaintiff,

v.

CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.,

Defendant

SPECIAL VERDICTS

We, the Jury, unanimously determine the Special Verdicts as follows:

1. Did plaintiff prove by the greater weight of the legal evidence that he was injured on April 2, 2007, while serving as the engineer of Locomotive CSXT 8160?

YESX	NO
------	----

If your answer to Special Verdict No. 1 is "Yes," please answer Special Verdict No. 2. If your answer to Special Verdict No. 1 is "No," please

sign the Special Verdict form and notify the Courtroom Deputy that you have completed your deliberations.

2. Did plaintiff prove by the greater weight of the legal evidence that on April 2, 2007, while serving as the engineer of Locomotive CSXT 8160 he was exposed to chlorine or chlorine containing compounds?

YES	NO
-----	----

If your answer to Special Verdict No. 2 is "Yes," please answer Special Verdict No. 3. If your answer to Special Verdict No. 2 is "No," please sign the Special Verdict form and notify the Courtroom Deputy that you have completed your deliberations.

3. Did plaintiff prove by the greater weight of the legal evidence that his exposure to chlorine or chlorine containing compounds on April 2, 2007 played a part, no matter how small, in bringing about any of plaintiff's alleged injuries?

YES X ___ NO____

If your answer to Special Verdict No. 3 is "Yes," please answer Special Verdict No. 4. If your answer to Special Verdict No. 3 is "No," please sign the Special Verdict form and notify the Courtroom Deputy that you have completed your deliberations.

4. Did plaintiff prove by the greater weight of the legal evidence that his exposure to chlorine or chlorine containing compounds on April 2, 2007 played a part, no matter how small, in causing him to contract RADS?

YES	X		NO	
-----	---	--	----	--

If your answer to Special Verdict No. 4 is "Yes," please answer Special Verdict No. 5. If your answer to Special Verdict No. 4 is "No," please answer Special Verdict No. 6.

5. Did plaintiff prove by the greater weight of the legal evidence that he suffered damages as a result of contracting RADS?

1L3 110	Y	ES	<i>x</i>	N	0	
---------	---	----	----------	---	---	--

Please proceed to Special Verdict No. 6.

6. Did plaintiff prove	by the gr	eater weight of the legal evidence
that he suffered damages r	esulting f	rom contracting any injury?
YES_	<i>X</i>	NO

If your answer to Special Verdict No. 5 or Special Verdict No. 6 is "Yes," please answer Special Verdict No. 7. If your answer to Special Verdict No. 5 and Special Verdict No. 6 is "No," please sign the Special Verdict form and notify the Courtroom Deputy that you have completed your deliberations.

7. State the total amount of damages plaintiff has proved by the greater weight of the legal evidence to which you find Charles Sunnycalb is entitled, itemized as follows:

After tax wages and fringe benefits plaintiff has lost, if any from April 2, 2007 to date:

\$ 250,190

The physical and mental/emotional pain and suffering and disability/loss of a normal life from April 2, 2007 to the date of your verdict, if any:

\$ 250,000

Future physical and mental/emotional pain and suffering and disability/loss of a normal life from the date of your verdict for the period of time you find the plaintiff will suffer same, if any:

\$ 360,000

The present value of the after tax wages, fringe benefits and retirement benefits which plaintiff is reasonably certain to lose in the future, if any:

\$ 653,916

The present value of prescription medication plaintiff is reasonably certain to need and receive in the future, if any:

\$ 108,000

Total:

\$ 1,622,106

centages are attributable to the The defects in Locomotive			100%
Other causes, if any (pleas	se list):	_	
		-	
		Total	<u>100</u> °
		or #5	
ease sign and date the Special /Juror #1 /Juror #2	s/Jui	or #5	
/Juror #1	s/Jui		

Date

8. Of the total damages identified in response to Special Verdict No. 7, what